



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,115	11/07/2001	Andreas Buos	085874-0381	4653

22428 7590 10/22/2003

FOLEY AND LARDNER
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

DABNEY, PHYLESHA LARVINIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2643

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/986,115

Applicant(s)

BUOS ET AL.

Examiner

Phylesha L Dabney

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/7/01.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9, 13-16, 18, 23-27, 31-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 10-12, 17, 19-22 and 28-30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4,6-7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the application filed on 7 November 2001 in which claims 1-45 are pending.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities: the words "base plate" was not mentioned previously. Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities: the words "threaded connection" was not mentioned in a preceding claim within the dependency chain; however, it was mentioned in claim 29. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 9, 14-15, 18, and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yanagishima (U.S. Patent No. 4,514,599).

Regarding claims 1-4, 9, 14-15, 18, and 23-27, Yanagishima teaches an inertial exciter for an acoustic radiator comprising a massive member (553-555); a coupler ⁵⁴⁶~~(547)~~ for attachment to an acoustic radiator (540); a motor (548, 553-556); and a suspension (550), wherein the

546
547

Art Unit: 2643

suspension acts in a plane *generally* passing through the center of mass of the massive member, thereby reducing any moment acting on the suspension.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 31-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fresard (U.S. Patent No. 4,4514,599).

Regarding claims 31-33, and 37-41, Fresard teaches an exciter attached to a base plate (6) in a repeatedly engageable manner (fig. 5). Fresard does not teach the base plate for attachment to an acoustic radiator in a non-repeatedly engageable manner. However, the examiner takes official notice that it is known to non-repeatedly engage a base plate to a radiation by using materials, such as adhesive glue, bonding cements, etc., for securely applying the exciter to a specific location. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a material such as adhesion in the invention of Fresard for firmly securing the exciter at a specific optimal location.

Regarding claims 34 and 43, Fresard teaches the releasable connection is a threaded connection (27).

Regarding claims 35-36, 42, and 44-45, Fresard teaches a locking device (inherently provided reverse threading of the elastomer, 10) for locking the threaded connection.

5. Claims 5-8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagishima (U.S. Patent No. 4,514,599).

Regarding claims 5-8 and 16, Yanagishima does not teach the specifics of the suspension as being a spider formed from a corrugated foil of metal, polymer, or strengthened cloth.

However, the examiner takes official notice that it is known in the art to make the suspension of materials such as thin metal plates, rubber or polymer, strengthened cloth, and cantilever type for achieving the desired elasticity and support. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the suspension of any material such as metal, polymer or strengthened cloth for achieving the desired elasticity and strength.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagishima (U.S. Patent No. 4,514,599) in view of Van Urk (U.S. Patent No. 2,698,917).

Regarding claim 13, Yanagishima teaches the magnet assembly comprising a magnet sandwiched between a magnet cup and a pole piece, the cup defining a magnet gap, which is filled with retentive fluid of suitable viscosity to damp motion of the voice coil. Van Urk teaches the desirability of a magnet assembly (fig. 2) comprising a magnet (1) sandwiched between a magnet cup (4) and a pole piece (5), the cup defining a magnet gap (8) for minimizing stray fields. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the cup-like magnetic assembly in the invention of Yanagishima, as taught by Van Urk, for minimizing stray fields. Furthermore, the combination of Yanagishima

Art Unit: 2643

and Van Urk does not teach filling the magnetic gap with retentive fluid. However, the examiner takes official notice that it is known in the art to fill the magnetic gap with retentive fluid of suitable viscosity to damp motion of the voice coil and removing heat. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include retentive fluid in the magnet gap of the combination of Yanagishima and Van Urk for the reasons stated above.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 10-12, 17, 19-22, 28-30, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phylesha L Dabney whose telephone number is 703-306-5415. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays 8:30-5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on 703-305-4708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Application/Control Number: 09/986,115

Page 6

Art Unit: 2643

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:


(703) 872-9314, for formal communications intended for entry and for informal or draft communications, please label "Proposed" or "Draft" when submitting an informal amendment.

(703) 306-0377, for customer service questions.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

PLD

September 25, 2003


CURTIS KUNTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600